

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD
IN HOMELAND SECURITY**

by

Colonel William F. Kuehn
United States Army National Guard

Colonel Daniel J. Jensen
Project Advisor

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 03 MAY 2004		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Role of the National Guard in Homeland Security				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) William Kuehn				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5050				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached file.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 26	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: William F. Kuehn
TITLE: THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD IN HOMELAND SECURITY
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 11 February 2004 PAGES: 25 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The United States experienced a wake-up call as a result of the terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C. on September 11, 2001. Many civic and military leaders had previously warned of the dangers by terrorists to this nation and its citizenry, but efforts to equip, train, and build appropriate safeguards to prevent and react to such actions and measures had been limited. The events on that September morning proved that this nation is no longer immune to terrorist atrocities within the confines of the homeland, and appropriate, expedient, and creative measures will be needed to meet this asymmetrical threat. Reserve Component forces have become the choice of military force to respond to incidences of homeland security (HLS), although the primary mission for these forces resides with the support to the combatant commanders for overseas contingencies. Various plans and actions have taken place to properly rebalance the force to better achieve success for both missions, but much work remains. This paper addresses issues related with the Total Force Policy as it affects the National Guard forces to meet both the HLS mission and the overseas combatant commander missions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	III
THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD IN HOMELAND SECURITY	1
RESERVE COMPONENT HISTORICAL EVOLUTION	1
HOMELAND SECURITY DEFINITION.....	2
MILITARY DUTY STATUS CATEGORIES	3
PRIOR TO 9/11.....	4
AFTER 9/11	6
RECOMMENDATIONS/ALTERNATIVES	8
STATE DEFENSE FORCES TO SUPPLEMENT THE NATIONAL GUARD	9
CONCLUSION	11
ENDNOTES	15
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19

THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD IN HOMELAND SECURITY

The sudden and unexpected terrorist events which occurred in New York City, Washington, D.C., and over the skies of Pennsylvania on September 11, 2001, changed many aspects in our lives, especially the renewed focus on protection of the homeland and the safety of its citizenry. Since the Civil War, threats of war were predominately considered to be outside the boundaries of the United States. The nation was isolated by two oceans and bracketed by peaceful neighbors, both north and south. Feeling a sense of internal national security from foreign hostilities, focus was directed towards a threat taking place outside the borders. Impending terrorist threats by foreign adversaries, directed towards U.S. citizens and high value infrastructure targets, have resulted in the homeland now as a theater of war.¹ As a result of these actions, future warfight contingencies should now include plans for homeland security scenarios, utilizing reserve component (RC) forces, specifically the National Guard, within the mix of force.

Throughout the last few years, numerous studies have been conducted to research the organization, roles, and missions for the RC. Efforts to define these have accelerated since homeland security (HLS) became the number one priority after 9/11, however much controversy still exists.

This paper begins with the evolving history of the RC organization and utilization for HLS missions as well as its support to the active component (AC) in overseas combat contingency missions, from the early beginnings of the nation to modern day military operations. Existing legal statutes and current force structure associated with the utilization and organization of both RC and AC forces are covered. Suggestions are presented to modify existing legal statutes, role definitions, and the current AC/RC organizational mix of force to better meet the ever changing military missions around the globe as well as within the state and nation. Finally, re-activation of the State Defense Force (SDF) concept is offered as a major militia contributor and force provider to assist the National Guard in its HLS role.

RESERVE COMPONENT HISTORICAL EVOLUTION

In early colonial days, no standing army existed so the colonists established a volunteer militia system modeled after a similar system utilized in England before it had its own standing army. The main purpose of this American territory militia force was to provide homeland defense.² Used as an on-call volunteer force, it was primarily used in a defensive posture but later did initiate some offensive raids against hostile Indian tribes as well as against some settlements of European nations who forced their will on the colonists.

“These local militias continued to exist throughout the 1800’s, although the composition of forces and organizations were not consistently established and maintained. Some were individual volunteers while others performed duty as a result of implied obligations for duty aligned with their local communities or states. State national units eventually evolved and took on the role of providing a war fighting reserve force to supplement regular AC forces.”³

In the mid 1970’s, the RC became even more aligned with the AC as a result of the Total Force Policy which essentially mandated that the RC, both Guard and Reserve, would be idealistically integrated into one fighting force. As a result of AC strength reductions and high operations tempo (OPTEMPO) in the 1990’s, the RC began to supplement the AC in numerous peacekeeping missions in such places as Kosovo, Macedonia, and Bosnia, as well as to provide combat, combat support, and combat service units in support of every major overseas conflict. The Guard’s national security role of today is this augmentation of the AC for wartime missions and is identified in Title 32, United States Code (USC):

“In accordance with the traditional military policy of the United States, it is essential that the strength and organization of the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the United States be maintained and assured at all times. Whenever Congress determines that more units and organizations are needed for the national security than are in the regular components of the ground and air forces, the Army National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States ... shall be ordered to active Federal duty and retained as long as so needed.”⁴

The increase in active duty missions does not diminish the fact that the Guard still provides support to the governors for state emergency missions as well as for HLS missions. This dual federal/state mission is unique to the National Guard since the other reserve forces only have a federal mission.

HOMELAND SECURITY DEFINITION

Although HLS is not a new phenomenon for the military and nation, not all sources and organizations are in complete agreement on its specific definition. Most agree that HLS is more a preventative measure against terrorism, whereas consequence management is the term used for those actions taken after the terrorist action or disaster has occurred. The definition of HLS varies slightly between what is specified in the Executive Order 13228 versus the definition identified by the Department of Defense (DOD), but both refer to the threat to the homeland from terrorist agents or entities. The federal government version is as follows:

“Homeland security is a concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America’s vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur.”⁵

The DOD version additionally includes civil support activities as well as homeland consequence and crisis management. Under this definition, it identifies HLS as:

“The preparation for, prevention of, defense against, and response to threats and aggressions directed towards U.S. territory, sovereignty, domestic population, and infrastructure; as well as crisis management, consequence management, and other domestic civil support.”⁶

MILITARY DUTY STATUS CATEGORIES

In order to discuss the assignment of military forces to HLS missions, it is critical to provide a basic understanding of military duty status for both active and reserve forces and those limiting factors associated specifically with the HLS role. The duty status which AC forces and Reserves fall under is U.S. Code (USC) Title 10, whereas the National Guard can be brought on duty in Title 32, Title 10, or State Active Duty (SAD) status.

Title 10 status applies to military service members in a federalized funded duty status. The Posse Comitatus Act, 18 USC 1385, prohibits the use of military forces in a law enforcement role except where authorized by a presidential order or an act of Congress.⁷ This act was established in 1878 as an attempt to prohibit federal troops from assuming the law and order role over civilians in the southern states after the Civil War. The use of most military forces for HLS missions are prohibited with the exception of the National Guard. The Guard is not prohibited from these missions and has been looked upon as the choice of force.

The Guard can be called to active duty both under Title 32 or Title 10. Under Title 32, the Guard can be activated and federally funded but would fall under the command and control of the state governor, whereas under federally funded Title 10 status, the Guard’s command and control would fall under the President or the Secretary of Defense. Shortly after 9/11, the Guard was called to active duty under Title 32 by order of the President but under command and control of the state governor to provide security for the nation’s commercial airports. Although the Guard has been relied upon to assist in HLS missions, its primary mission is identified in Title 32, which states that the Guard, as part of the RC, is to complement the AC in defense of the nation.

Guard forces can also be brought on duty under Title 32 but in SAD status, normally as a result of a call-up by the Governor in response to emergencies and disasters within the state. Under SAD, the Governor retains command and control and the state assumes liability for any claims associated with the duty.

The ability to provide Guard forces under Title 32, either federally funded or in SAD status, provides a quick responsive contingency of trained and resourced support to first responders for local or regional emergencies. It is advantageous to provide activated Guard forces in either SAD or federally funded Title 32 status to support local disasters or emergencies within the state. First, Guard forces are perceived as local citizens of the community or state and are more readily accepted by the local populace to assist first responders. Second, the assignment of decentralized individual soldiers or small contingencies of forces or units with other agencies to assist first responders is often times more agreeable for National Guard leadership than active duty leadership. Third, many of the activated Guard members are employees of the various agencies supported during period of activations. These Guard members blend their experience and knowledge of both their own civilian agencies as well as that of the military to better accomplish the emergency or disaster mission. The interagency process is benefited as a result of this unique duality citizen soldier construct.⁸

PRIOR TO 9/11

A few years before the 9/11 disaster, an effort to increase the role of the RC forces in HLS resulted out of an attempt to resolve controversy over proposed RC strength reductions. The 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) identified military requirements after the breakup of the Soviet Union which also ended the Cold War.⁹ Identified in the QDR were drastic strength cuts for all four service components of the RC forces, with the heaviest reduction in relative terms within the Army.¹⁰ The proposed force reductions created debate over the RC relevancy and leadership.

As a result of this controversy and in an attempt to resolve the arguments over reductions and identify the future force structure for the RC, the Secretary of Defense directed Reserve Component Employment 2005 Study (RCE-05) in 1998.¹¹ The RCE-5 Study identified a renewed interest in utilizing RC forces for HLS missions and actually brought back HLS into the forefront as a theater of war. Recommendations included assigning both war time missions and HLS missions to certain RC units, converting Air National Guard Bare Base Air Wings (Prime Beef) to consequence management units, establishing Joint Reserve Component Virtual

Information Operations Organizations (JRVIOs) with part-time RC forces to detect and counter computer attacks, and assigning RC forces to joint staffs for homeland defense.¹²

Recommendations of the Study spawned controversy. One objection was the use of RC forces in the law enforcement role of HLS without the permission of Congress because of the Posse Comitatus Act restrictions, although this only applies to the Reserves and not the National Guard. Another issue involved the conflict with the assignment of both the HLS missions, as well as missions to support the AC in overseas combat operations. The cost to perform both missions is restrictive and, additionally, to have both mission assignments might distract from the readiness perspective for the combat contingency missions.¹³ Readiness levels for both missions may be impaired by this dual mission requirement since units may not be able to concentrate adequately on either one.

The leadership of the RC forces as well as the Army and Air Force was not convinced that funding would follow the assignment of an additional mission. In the past, funding for RC forces usually was prioritized for the high priority combat units and not for combat service and combat service support units. They were skeptical that funding would be adequately addressed for missions other than combat.

The Commission on National Security/21st Century Report (Hart-Rudman Commission) is another study that discusses HLS missions.¹⁴ It consists of reports in three separate phases which addresses the vulnerability of the nation to weapons of mass destruction. The Phase III Report describes its determination of the National Guard's role in HLS. According to its recommendation, the Secretary of Defense should designate that a primary mission of the National Guard should be HLS, however, in order to fulfill this mission the Guard needs to be appropriately resourced, organized, and trained to be successful.¹⁵ Obviously, some resources currently used to support the AC for wartime missions would need to be redirected to activities commensurate with HLS and military support to civilian authorities.

Since the release of the Phase III Report, much discussion has taken place over the primary mission for the Guard. Some have interpreted this to mean that HLS is the primary mission rather than a primary mission for the Guard. This issue was clarified by Warren Rudman himself, with the following statement:

“One of our recommendations that has been vastly misunderstood is, we talk about forward deployment of U.S. forces, the United States National Guard is forward deployed in this country, and in the event of the kind of Holocaust we’re talking about, they are the best people to aid local authorities in their states as they do now. Some of them have thought we were recommending, who didn’t read the report, that that be their primary mission. We say it should be a

secondary mission. Their primary mission is the one to support the regular forces in time of national emergency, particularly in times of war.”¹⁶

Rudman’s statement is echoed by the feelings of most of the Guard’s senior leadership. The Guard’s position is that restructuring the force is overdue, however, the Total Force concept is still valid and the Guard should be included in both wartime contingencies as well as HLS missions.

AFTER 9/11

A new unified combatant command, U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM), was established after 9/11 with the responsibility for homeland defense and military support to civilian authorities. The area of responsibility for NORTHCOM includes all of the continental United States plus Canada, Mexico, Alaska, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and 500 miles out in the Atlantic, Pacific, and the Caribbean coastal waters.¹⁷ Both NORTHCOM and the Department of Homeland Security, headed by Secretary Tom Ridge, will be responsible for military and civilian forces, respectively, for HLS missions. The majority of military forces provided to NORTHCOM in the event of major HLS incidents will be the National Guard. The majority of these Guard forces, however, are currently trained to supplement the other combatant commanders for wartime contingencies, not HLS missions. They may not always be available to respond when needed for NORTHCOM’s HLS missions because of their other wartime duty responsibilities.

Numerous resource issues are associated with the reliance upon the Guard for HLS missions. These include such things as funding, types of units, personnel strength, and training opportunities. Fiscal year funding is filtered down to the states through the National Guard Bureau to supply and train the force, primarily in support of overseas combat missions for the combatant commanders. To better prepare for federal HLS missions, funding will need to be supplied to adequately equip and train the force before missions are assigned. In the past, the Guard has acquired funding for training, operations, maintenance, equipment, and programs from Congress, but it has not been real successful in obtaining the funding support from combatant commanders. Since NORTHCOM is now responsible for HLS and the Guard seems to be the military force of choice for HLS, it would seem feasible that the Guard may now have a advocate to seek needed HLS funds which will help the Guard with this asymmetric threat.¹⁸

Another resource problem associated with this issue concerns the right mix of force structure currently residing within the Guard. Since there has been a close association with

combat missions, adequate quantities of HLS type units and specialists such as combat support teams, military police, linguists, civil affairs specialists, and chemical units do not exist. If the Guard is required to assume these duties on a regular basis, the appropriate mix of force structure must be adjusted. There is no real force structure in the Guard that currently exists to be dedicated for the HLS mission with the exception of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD-CST's). Only about one half of the states, however, even has a full-time, 22-man, joint Army/Air Guard WMD-CST, although the 2004 Defense Appropriations Act includes funding to provide 12 more teams.¹⁹ Funding for the remaining teams is still in question. Trained and certified to identify nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological threats, these teams are designed to react quickly to HLS incidents and assist official civil first responders with trained technical expertise.²⁰

Active forces now heavily rely upon RC units, both Guard and Reserve, to provide needed combat, combat support, and combat service units to their force structure when deployed to conduct combat missions. Most force structure which exists in the Guard today was established to provide combat units to supplement the AC for wartime contingencies with over 54% of the Army's combat structure residing within the Guard.²¹ Because the Guard has become the force of choice for this mission, consideration for more combat support and combat service support will be reviewed and then planned for the Guard in support of this asymmetrical threat. With the renewed interest in HLS since 9/11, this pattern of building up combat structure in the Guard is beginning to change.²² Consequently, force structure changes made within the Guard would necessitate force structure changes within the active forces. In order to take on the HLS as a major role for the Guard, the AC force must be re-structured for major contingencies in order to be less dependent upon the Guard forces who may be needed for catastrophic attacks and emergencies at home.²³ This will require a realignment of the forces so that the AC forces absorb the combat, combat service and combat service support units lost by the Guard force structure realignment.

Some progress to restructure the Guard forces to be more appropriately aligned with HLS missions has been realized. Some states began to convert some combat structure to combat support and combat service support during the first two phases of the Army Division Redesign Study (ADRS).²⁴ Additionally, the Army National Guard Restructuring Initiative identified the conversion of some mechanized and armored brigades to be converted to wheeled Mobile Light Brigades. This structure is more versatile for many missions, ranging from HLS to major combat conflicts.²⁵ In the fall of 2003, the announcement was made that some of the current artillery battalions in the Guard will be converted to military police structure, needed both by the

Guard for HLS missions as well as for the AC in combat, peacekeeping missions, and homeland defense missions. Some engineer and chemical structure conversions are also planned in the future.²⁶

Even though the primary mission of the Guard is to supplement the AC for national security missions, it still must be able to respond to its other local role within the state during times of emergencies at the direction of the Governor. During recent years, the Guard has been ordered to active deployment in increased numbers and for extended periods of time.²⁷ This has primarily been a result of active force strength reductions of 34% coupled with a 300% in mission rates during the last decade.²⁸ Most recently, many RC units on active duty were informed that their tour of duty will be extended. This surely will impact significantly on recruiting and retention within the Guard, but is too early to gather many statistics.

The Guard has been stretched thin during the last few years with numerous deployments as well as state missions in response to local catastrophic events. The debate remains as to what role the Guard can play and be able to sustain before retention problems heavily impact readiness levels and mission effectiveness. Current force structure levels in the Guard are not sufficient to adequately perform continuous deployments, state domestic emergency missions, and HLS missions.

RECOMMENDATIONS/ALTERNATIVES

Can the Guard continually maintain a high level of operational readiness for wartime conflicts as well as being trained and ready for HLS missions whenever they arise within the states? Is the increased addition of HLS missions too much to weigh upon the Guard, coupled with the Guard's primary mission of supporting the combatant commanders? Various alternatives exist for this issue to meet the demands of HLS. The following alternatives are provided to portray how the Guard may be structured to meet this asymmetric threat:

Alternative one would be to restrict the Guard from supplementing the active forces in times of national security and have it concentrate only on state and HLS missions. Support to AC missions would have to be met with the Army and Air reserve units and/or the transfer of the Guard's current force structure to the AC. The force structure transfer would require increases in active troop strength. This concept would not be politically amenable and statutory language would need to be changed since, under Title 32, the Guard's primary role is to complement the AC in defense of the nation. Because of the needed changes in statutory language, resultant RC mission changes, and increased AC end strength, this concept would be difficult to accomplish.

A second alternative would be to eliminate any requirement for HLS missions for the Guard. The Guard would maintain the other two missions of state emergencies and assist AC forces in combat missions. This alternative is the least disruptive for the military as it maintains the current structure and mission assignment capability. It does not, however, address how HLS missions will be met. Under this alternative, local state civilian forces would have to accept the missions through federal funding mandates. The ability for states to adequately meet the personnel, training, and fiscal requirements for this scenario would be highly suspect. Most states have experienced severe budgetary deficits in recent years and this option would not seem achievable.

A third alternative would be to vastly increase Guard force structure with appropriate units and troop strength so that state needs as well as federal needs can be met. Both federal and state missions could be accomplished since additional forces would make that a reality. Budget restrictions and additional recruiting challenges, however, would impede the progress of this alternative and not make this option seem easily attainable.²⁹

Since these alternatives do not seem economically or politically feasible, a fourth alternative is a combination of some of the previously mentioned alternatives. This alternative would be to increase M-Day troop strength by only 40,000 to 50,000, dedicated to the Guard for HLS missions while other domestic and active overseas combat mission capabilities remain in place. States would receive a battalion or brigade size element devoted to HLS, dependent upon the size of the state, existing force structure, and political variables. These troops would be trained specifically in HLS type missions and other units would be held intact for domestic emergencies and overseas active missions. This alternative would increase the budget of the DOD but it may be offset by funds from the Department of Homeland Defense. Although this alternative requires additional funding and some RC troop strength increases, such actions are needed to meet the new threat. Under this scenario, statutory language changes, political consequences, and fiscal requirements would be minimized.

Today, attempts are being made to realign both the AC and RC forces so that the AC can become less reliant upon the RC and the RC will be better adept to respond to HLS missions. These actions are taking place while the Total Force posture remains constant with the RC maintaining a relevant force to supplement the AC for combat contingencies.

STATE DEFENSE FORCES TO SUPPLEMENT THE NATIONAL GUARD

Another way to approach the HLS mission, rather than to simply increase or drastically restructure either or both the RC and/or AC, is to re-institutionalize the State militia construct.

Different and much less expensive to establish and maintain than the National Guard or Reserves, these militia forces have been described with various titles throughout their history. They have been assigned a number of names to include: State Guard, State Defense Forces, National Guard Reserves, and State Military Forces. The term State Defense Force (SDF) is used here to describe these military forces.³⁰ The SDF is a military type force composed of volunteers who are established, trained, and controlled by the state. Even though they are volunteers, they are funded by the state when called to duty by the governor, through The Adjutant General.

The SDF concept was used during World Wars I and II when many of the RC forces were activated and mobilized. Establishment of this military type force for state security was identified in the Home Defense Act enacted in 1917 and then later clarified and modified in 1940.³¹ These volunteer forces were not consistently organized or trained from one state to another, but did provide some sort of state security for those governors who decided to establish a force. After WWI, many of the SDF were disbanded, however they were resurrected again when the nation became involved with WWII. They were resurrected again during WWII to support the governors since most military forces were mobilized but soon dissolved once more at the end of WWII. During the next few decades the numbers of SDF's have diminished.

Today, these volunteer forces are separate from the National Guard as well as the Civil Defense. They are funded by the state and under control of the governor and Adjutant General of the National Guard. Governors do not have to be concerned with the Title 10 versus Title 32 issue since the SDF is strictly funded and controlled by the state. Even though all the states have the authority to establish and maintain a SDF, little less than half of the states actually have one. The strength of the SDF has dwindled to around 8,000 nationwide.³² It is highly likely that many of the Guard forces may be occupied in support of the AC forces overseas when a HLS event occurs here at home. They may not be within their home state when needed for HLS. As a result, it is extremely important that NORTHCOM is familiar with the roles and capabilities of the SDF to ensure proper contingency and consequence management.³³

The Rudman Commission stated that forces assigned to HLS missions need specialized training. The National Guard is the main force to provide NORTHCOM with trained soldiers and airmen to fulfill the HLS mission requirements, however, most of them are trained for combat type missions, and may also be mobilized overseas and unavailable when needed here at home.³⁴ The SDFs help to fill this void since they do not have a federal warfight mission to send them out of the state and country, and many are trained and certified by the Federal Emergency

Management Agency (FEMA) in civil support duties. Some personnel may have a competing mission, however, if they fulfill the role of a first responder as well as a member of the SDF.

“The primary contributions SDFs offer to NORTHCOM lie in providing personnel specialized in emergency management to support contingency planning, preparation, and coordination, and to operate the command, control, and communications (C3) facilities set up in response crises. SDF personnel man duty stations in the state Emergency Operations Centers and state Joint Operations Centers, and SDFs are capable of providing C3 facilities and headquarters in the field. Most SDFs provide manning at fixed C3 facilities, but some also have the ability to man mobile command posts.”³⁵

Both NORTHCOM and the Department of Homeland Security can coordinate with the governors to integrate the SDF along with the National Guard into preparation for HLS consequence management planning. This may include bilateral agreements with contiguous states to help neighbors with trained SDFs as part of their emergency response plans to assist civilian first responders.

Although the SDF structure seems to be an important force in response to HLS situations and fills an important void during times when the Guard is mobilized for overseas missions, it has not been met with enthusiasm by the senior leadership of National Guard. Much of this non-acceptance by the National Guard Bureau and some Adjutants General are due to political rather than mission capable rationale. Political turf battles mainly occurred when of some senior SDF generals were appointed as lieutenant generals and wore one more star the Guard's Adjutant Generals, as well as when SDFs actually assumed the role as the State's military force and competed with the “real” Guard. These petty issues should not be a major reason to abandon the SDF program.³⁶ The construct has worked well for many states and more recently seems to be an efficient way to provide a trained force for consequence management without providing huge sums of federal funds to vastly restructure the AC and RC forces.

CONCLUSION

This paper addresses some of the issues commensurate with the Total Force Policy as it affects the HLS mission and describes an alternative force that can be used to provide trained personnel to assist and sometimes replace the National Guard in this mission. These issues include force structure realignment with relevant units, WMD-CST integration, Total Force continuation, dual missioning, HLS funding, and SDF integration.

Although the Guard has been able to secure units relevant for the AC under the Total Force Policy, a void exists to adequately address the HLS missions. More units and specialty MOS's are needed in the Guard such as military police, medical, chemical, linguists, and civil affairs. To accomplish this task, some of the existing Guard structure must be realigned with the AC.

The CSTs provide a much needed force of highly talented and trained group of full time personnel within the Guard to provide support to chemical, biological, and radiological threats. Only 32 of these teams currently exist with 12 more identified for future funding. The remaining teams need to be funded so that all states can field a team.

The Total Force Policy has been politically successful by keeping relevant units in the RC which are needed by the AC when preparing for major combat operations. Force structure kept in the RC that is only needed for major operations reduces the operational costs of the AC but ensures their availability when needed.

The dual missioning concept is working and can remain in effect even with the addition of the HLS mission if WMD-CSTs are fully fielded, certain HLS type units and MOS's are realigned within the Guard, and the SDF is implemented in more states. Some specific units and the CSTs may need to be identified only for HLS missions, especially within states that have high value targets.

Guard units valued by the AC as high priority units have historically received a higher level of resources than lesser relevant units. This type of emphasis on funding needs to be applied to units which are recognized as those needed for HLS missions.

The SDF construct should be integrated into states that have local resources to support the force. These teams provide trained personnel to counter terrorist threats and provide support for HLS missions. They also do not have a wartime mission so they will be available to the governor and Adjutant General even if the Guard units within the state are mobilized.

Meeting the challenge of HLS is not new for the National Guard, although the enemy now poses a much different asymmetrical threat unlike any adversary in history. Being able to respond quickly to a local terrorist threat or incident, the Guard is, and will remain, the state and federal force of choice for governors and the President. To meet this threat, the Guard seems to be the force most appropriately and legally aligned, trained, and available to quickly respond. The Total Force Policy has transformed the AC and RC forces so that the AC is now reliant upon the RC forces during any major conflict for additional support, especially combat and combat service support units. The National Guard in each state continually strives to obtain relevant units that meet the local recruiting demographics as well as the needs of the AC

warfight. Relevant RC units are funded at a higher level than those units that are in less demand for AC combat missions. The Total Force Policy thus seems to be politically and functionally successful and will continue to function in the future. However, because of its dual missioning responsibilities, the Guard may not always be available when needed for the HLS contingency.

WORD COUNT=5394

ENDNOTES

¹Jack Spencer and Larry M. Wortzel, "The Role of the National Guard in Homeland Security," April 2002; available from <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/wortzel.htm> ; Internet; accessed 23 September 2003.

²Richard H. Kohn. "Using the Military at Home: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," Spring 2003; available from <<http://proquest.umi.com>>; Internet; accessed 23 September 2003.

³Ibid.

⁴Don Edwards and Richard Dunn, "The National Guard's Enhanced Role in Homeland Security," March 2001; available from <<http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/displayArticle.asp?article=5>>; Internet; accessed 22 September 2003.

⁵George W. Bush, *National Strategy For Homeland Security* (Washington, D.C.: The White House, July 2002), 2.

⁶Steven J. Tomisek, "Homeland Security: The New Role for Defense," *Journal Of Homeland Security* April 2002 [journal on-line]; available from <<http://homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/displayArticle.asp?article=53>>; Internet; accessed 23 September 2003.

⁷Michael G. Leventhal, "The Posse Comitatus Act of 1878;" available from http://www.dojgov.net/posse_comitatus_act.htm ; Internet; accessed 26 January 2004.

⁸Philip Oates, "Supporting The National Strategy For Homeland Security: The Role Of The National Guard," *Perspectives on Preparedness* 8 (August 2002); 3.

⁹William S. Cohen, "Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review," May 1997; available from <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/qdr>; Internet; accessed 22 January 2004.

¹⁰James Jay Carafano, "The Reserves and Homeland Security: Proposals, Progress, Problems Ahead," 19 June 2002; available from <<http://csbaonline.org>>; Internet; accessed 3 November 2003.

¹¹Stephen G. Yusem, "The Roles and Missions of the Reserve Forces: A White Paper Issued by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States;" available from http://www.roa.org/pdf/about_us/roles_mission.pdf; Internet; accessed 22 January 2004.

¹²Carafano.

¹³Carafano.

¹⁴Gary Hart and Warren B. Rudman, "Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change," 15 February 2001; available from <http://www.nssg.gov/PhaseIIIFR.pdf>; Internet; accessed 22 January 2004.

¹⁵Michael P. Fleming, "National Security Roles for the National Guard," August 2001; available from <<http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/Fleming.htm>>; Internet; accessed 29 November 2003.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷James Jay Carafano, "Shaping the Future of Northern Command," *Backgrounder*, 29 April 2003.

¹⁸Oates, 5.

¹⁹Jeremy Feiler, "McHale: DOD To Choose States To Host New Civil Support Teams," *Inside The Pentagon*, (November 13, 2003): 11.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Fleming.

²²Oates, 4.

²³Spencer and Wortzel.

²⁴Anonymous, "Army National Guard Divisions," available from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/army/division-armg.htm> ; Internet; accessed 25 January 2004.

²⁵Colin Robinson, "The Army National Guard's Restructuring for Homeland Security," 1 August 2003; available from <<http://www.edi.org>>; Internet; accessed 3 November 2003.

²⁶The ideas in this paragraph are based on remarks made by a speaker participating in the Commandant's Lecture Series.

²⁷Anonymous, "Major National Guard Call-Ups," available from <http://www.ngaus.org/newsroom/guard101-callups.asp>; Internet; accessed 22 January 2004.

²⁸Fleming.

²⁹John R. Brinkeroff, "The Changing of the Guard: Evolutionary Alternatives for America's National Guard," May 2002; available from <<http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/displayArticle.asp?article=59>>; Internet; accessed 22 September 2003.

³⁰John R. Brinkeroff, "Restore the Militia for Homeland Security," November 2001; available from <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/Articles/Brinkerhoff_Nov01.htm>; Internet; accessed 17 November 2003.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

³³Arthur N., Tulak, Robert W. Kraft, and Don Silbaugh. "State Defense Forces and Homeland Security," *Parameters* 23 (Winter 2003-04): 133.

³⁴Ibid., 137.

³⁵Ibid., 140.

³⁶Brinkeroff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anonymous. "Army National Guard Divisions." Available from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/army/division-arng.htm> . Internet. Accessed 25 January 2004.
- Anonymous. "Major National Guard Call-Ups." Available from <http://www.ngaus.org/newsroom/guard101-callups.asp>. Internet. Accessed 22 January 2004.
- Brinkerhoff, John R. "The Changing of the Guard: Evolutionary Alternatives for America's National Guard." *Journal of Homeland Security*. May 2002. Available from <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/displayArticle.asp?article=59>>. Internet. Accessed 22 September 2003.
- _____. "Restore the Militia for Homeland Security." *Journal of Homeland Security*. November 2001. Available from <http://www.homelandsecurity.org>>. Internet. Accessed 17 November 2003.
- Bush, George W. *National Strategy For Homeland Security*. Washington, D.C.: The White House, July 2002.
- Carafono, James Jay. "The Reserves and Homeland Security: Proposals, Programs, Problems Ahead." *Backgrounder*. 19 June 2002. Available from <http://www.csbaonline.org>>. Internet. Accessed 3 November 2003.
- _____. "Shaping the Future of Northern Command." *Backgrounder*, 29 April 2003.
- Cohen, William S. "Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review." Available from <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/qdr>>. Internet. Accessed 22 January 2004.
- Edwards, Don and Dunn, Richard. "The National Guard's Enhanced Role in Homeland Security." *Journal of Homeland Security*. March 2001. Available from <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/displayArticle.asp?article=5>>. Internet. Accessed 22 September 2003.
- Feiler, Jeremy, "McHale: DOD To Choose States To Host New Civil Support Teams," *Inside The Pentagon*, (12 November 2003): 11
- Fleming, Michael P. "National Security Roles for the National Guard." August 2001. Internet. Available from <http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/Fleming.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 29 November 2003.
- Hart, Gary and Rudman, Warren B., "Road Map for National Security: Imperative for Change." 15 February 2001. Available from <http://www.nssg.gov/PhaseIIIFR.pdf>>. Internet. Accessed 22 January 2004.
- Kohn, Richard H. "Using the Military at Home: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow." *Chicago Journal of International Law*. Spring 2003. Available from <http://proquest.umi.com>>. Internet. Accessed 23 September 2003.

- Leventhal, Michael G. "The Posse Comitatus Act of 1878." Available from <http://www.dojgov.net/posse_comitatus_act.htm>. Internet. Accessed 26 January 2004.
- Levin, Carl. "America's citizen-soldiers: An expanding role in the national defense." *The Officer* 79 (Jan/Feb 2003): 17-20.
- Lieberman, Joe. Refocusing Military Resources to Strengthen Homeland Security. Posture Statement presented to a Progressive Policy Institute forum. Washington, D.C., 2002.
- Oates, Philip. "Supporting The National Strategy For Homeland Security: The Role Of The National Guard." *Perspectives on Preparedness* 8 (August 2002): 1-12.
- Robinson, Colin. "The Army National Guard's Restructuring for Homeland Security." Center For Defense Information. 1 August 2003. Available from <<http://www.edi.org>>. Accessed 3 November 2003.
- Spencer, Jack. "The National Guard and Homeland Security." The Heritage Foundation. 29 July 2002. Available from <<http://www.heritage.org/Research/HomelandDefense/EM826.cfm>>. Internet. Accessed 23 September 2003.
- Spencer, Jack and Wortzel, Larry M. "The Role of the National Guard in Homeland Security." April 2002. Available from <<http://homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/wortzel.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 23 September 2003.
- Tomisek, Steven J. "Homeland Security: The New Role For Defense." *Journal of Homeland Security*. April 2002. Available from <<http://homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/displayArticle.asp?article=53>>. Internet. Accessed 23 September 2003.
- Tulak, Arthur N., Kraft, Robert W., and Silbaugh, Don. "State Defense Forces and Homeland Security." *Parameters* 23 (Winter 2003-04): 132-146.
- Yusem, Stephen G. "The Roles and Missions of the Reserve Forces: A White Paper Issued by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States." Available from <http://www.roa.org/pdf/about_us/roles_mission.pdf>. Internet. Accessed 22 January 2004.